585 263 1600

* Serial No.: 09/811,838

-6-

Remarks

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants would like to thank Examiner Stockton for the courtesy extended to the undersigned representative during the telephone conference on July 28, 2004. During the telephone conference, the new matter rejection (below) and applicants' proposed amendment were discussed. Examiner Stockton later confirmed that the proposed amendment would overcome the new matter rejection.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to encompass the generic concept as identified at pages 2-3 of the outstanding office action.

The rejection of claims 1, 3-7, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (first paragraph) is respectfully traversed in view of the above amendments. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") has taken the position that written descriptive support does not exist for the rangelimitation present in the final "wherein" clause of claim 1. Applicant has amended the clause to recite that, under the listed conditions, "R1 is a straight chain C10 to C18 alkyl group." Adequate written descriptive support exists for the presently claimed subgenus. In particular, in addition to the discussion of the genus of formula (I) on page 17-19 and the subgenus of formula (III) on pages 19-20, the examples disclose four species within formula (III). In particular, Example 5 describes and Figure 3 illustrates the synthesis of compounds 55 (bearing a C10 group as R1), 56 (bearing a C14 group as R1), 57 (bearing a C18 group as R1), and 56a (bearing a C10 group as R1). These four compounds are species within the presently claimed subgenus. Applicant submits that the generic and subgeneric disclosure of formulae (I) and (III) in combination with the above-identified species falling within the presently claimed subgenus is sufficient to satisfy the written description requirement. See Ex parte Sorenson, 3 USPQ2d 1462 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. 1987). Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (first paragraph) is improper and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by each of: (i) Noort et al., "Solid Phase Synthesis of Peptides Containing a Phosphoserine-Sulfur Adduct," <u>Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.</u> 6(16):2007-2012 (1996) ("Noort"); (ii) Avaeva et al., "Action of Acidic Phosphomonoesterase of Wheat Bran on the Methylamide of N-Benzoyl-O-Pyrophosphoserine," <u>Khim. Prir. Soedin</u> 5(6):551-554 (1969), CAPLUS Accession No. 1970: 431861 (Document No. 73:31861) ("Avaeva I"); and (iii) Avaeva et al., "Hydrolysis of R705440.2

Serial No.: 09/811,838

-7-

Phosphoric Ester Serine Derivatives Containing Free Amino or Carboxylic Acid Groups," Vestn. Mosk. Univ. Khim. 12(5):627-8 (1971), CAPLUS Accession No. 1972:34548 (Document No. 76:34548) ("Avaeva II") is respectfully traversed.

Noort teaches a phosphoserine compound (2) as a reaction intermediate in the production of peptides containing serine thioglycol phosphate. Compound (2) has the structure shown below:

(see Scheme 1 at page 2008). Thus, when X^2 is R^1R^2N — with R^2 being H, and Q^2 is =0, R^1 at the X^2 position is methyl. The methyl group taught by Noort clearly does not fall within the limitation of a straight chain C10 to C18 alkyl group as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Noort fails to provide any teaching or suggestion to replace the methyl group with a longer alkyl group within the C10 to C18 range, and the PTO has not indicated otherwise. (It should be noted that applicants have excluded hydrogen from the scope of R^1 ; therefore, the PTO's interpretation of Noort set forth on page 7 of the outstanding office action is moot.) For these reasons, the rejection of claims 1 and 3 over Noort is improper and should be withdrawn.

Avaeva I teaches hydrolysis of the S-enantiomer, methylamide derivative of N-benzoyl-O-phosphoserine with an extracted wheat bran acid phosphatase. The methylamide derivative has the structure shown below:

Without waiving challenge to the enablement of Avaeva I (which, unlike the full article to which the abstract corresponds, is art of record), applicants submit that Avaeva I fails to anticipate the presently claimed invention for the same reasons asserted above with respect to R705440.2

Serial No.: 09/811,838

Noort. In particular, Avaeva I fails to teach or suggest that, when X^2 is R^1R^2N — with R^2 being H, and Q^2 is =0, R^1 at the X^2 position is a straight chain C10 to C18 alkyl group as recited in claim 1. For these reasons, the rejection of claims 1 and 3 over Avaeva I is improper.

Avaeva II teaches the hydrolysis, in mild acid or mild alkaline, of the methylamide derivative of N-benzoyl-O-phosphoserine shown above in the description of Avaeva I as well as the hydrolysis of the methylamide derivative of phosphoserine shown below:

Without waiving challenge to the enablement of Avaeva II (which, unlike the full article to which the abstract corresponds, is art of record), applicants submit that Avaeva II fails to anticipate the presently claimed invention for the same reasons asserted above with respect to Noort and Avaeva I. In particular, Avaeva I fails to teach or suggest that, when X^2 is R^1R^2N —with R^2 being H, and Q^2 is =0, R^1 at the X^2 position is a straight chain C10 to C18 alkyl group as recited in claim 1. For these reasons, the rejection of claims 1 and 3 over Avaeva II is improper.

In view of all of the foregoing, applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 2, 2004

Edwin V. Merkel Registration No. 40,087

NIXON PEABODY LLP Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051 Rochester, New York 14603-1051 Telephone: (585) 263-1128 Facsimile: (585) 263-1600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
- Examinited by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306.

August 2, 2004

Date

Laura L. Sonneville

R705440.2